

DEC 31 1955

Ag. 3-1

MUNCIE (Ind.) STAR

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP70-00058R000100030001-6

Circ.: m. 28,218  
S. 29,653

Front Page Edit Page Other Page

Date:

DEC 31 1955

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

X-Econ 4

## Who's Making U.S. Policy?

The weirdest thing about the rise of 100 per cent requested by Secretary of State Dulles in foreign aid funds over the amount appropriated for the current year is the fact that nobody in Congress seems to have expected it. On the contrary, the doubling of U.S. foreign aid plans seems to have been decided on within the last few days. Congressional leaders who attended a White House briefing eight days ago came away with the impression that no significant increase in giveaway funds would be asked. This is stated flatly by Representative Leslie C. Arends, Republican of Illinois, who was at the meeting. Democratic leaders like Senators Byrd and George, who also attended the conference, were flabbergasted by the news. And Mr. Dulles, in making the announcement of the rise official after weeks of sending aloft trial balloons, was forced to tell his press conference that he "regretted" there had been a "genuine misunderstanding" on the question.

That's certainly the understatement of the century. When the nation's legislative leaders get the impression that foreign aid is going to be cut, or held steady, and instead it is doubled, that, citizens, is a misunderstanding.

It is said in Washington that Allen W. Dulles, chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, is the architect responsible for the "new look" in the giveaway program. If this is so, it is an amazing tribute to the efficacy of the CIA boss that he could effect a major change in our governmental policy so silently and swiftly. If only the CIA could score such successes in influencing foreign governments!

The explicit reasons for the rise in appropriations requested are, as usual, not stated. Secretary Dulles did say that actual spending in the forthcoming fiscal year will be only \$200 million higher than in the current one. The excess money will go into the "appropriated but unspent" reserve, raising this to about \$7 billion. This, Dulles said, is necessary because weapons "take a long time to manufacture." Assuming that this is so—isn't it about time our prosperous European friends began to assume the obligation to pay for their own arms? Does this mean that even two or three years hence there is no possibility that the U.S. can get out from under these growing military and economic giveaways?

That's just what it does mean. Mr. Dulles himself, in responding to reporters' questions, said assistance to other nations will have to go on for an indefinite period of time!

Assuming it was Allen Dulles who pushed for this program—who assented to it? Was it the still partially convalescing Mr. Eisenhower? Was it Sherman Adams and the White House "staff"? Was it the President's brother, Milton? If these men were able to win for their higher-spending views against the reported opposition of Treasury Secretary Humphrey and they of the head of the International Cooperation Administration himself, John B. Hollister, they wield a great deal of power.

Maybe these decisions are made in none of these ways! Are they made, worst of all, by the fact that this country has surrendered the initiative in foreign affairs altogether to the Kremlin? Do we take steps like this merely out of reaction to the "failure" or falsely inflated hopes for Geneva? Or because we're panicked by the tour of the Red super-salesmen in India, or because of vicissitudes of politics in the Middle East?

Has the spending of money in vast amounts become a substitute for thinking? Do we reach for the purse every time we begin to feel insecure?

It certainly is about time we tried at least one "dry" year in which the spigot of giveaways would be turned off completely—just to test the result on our friends, and on our own morale, courage and effectiveness in the world.

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP70-00058R000100030001-6